CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Serious situation due to concentration of Naval Forces of big Powers in the Indian Ocean

DR. (SHRIMATI) NAJMA HEPTULLA (Maharashtra): Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Defence to the serious situation arising out of the concentration of naval forces of big powers in the Indian Ocean, posing a threat to the security of our country and the action taken by Government in this regard.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN): Sir, located as we are on the globe, the Indian Ocean, which indeed derives its name from our country, is an expanse of water which has the potential of shaping our destiny.

In and under the ocean and on its bed there are believed to lie abundant natural resources. The traditional marine resource has been its yield of fish, and with it derivatives such as fish oil and proteins. It holds, together with the Bay of Bengal and the Arabian Sea, therefore vast prospects for improving the nutritional standards of the world as a whole and of the region in particular. Under the seas in this region, particularly in our Exclusive Economic Zone, there are fine prospects of locating also petroleum and natural gas, resources which are always welcome in view of the ever increasing needs of energy to fuel our development process. On the western sea board the platforms of Bombay High involving a capital investment of thousands of crores are already in production and the value of this production is of the order of well over Rs. 5000 crores annually. The intrinsic value of these assets are much higher, leading as they do both to self sufficiency as well as to conservation of foreign exchange. Exploration is continuing at various places on both the western and eastern sea boards and there is every likelihood that other reserves would also be located. These resources apart, the possibility of exploring for and exploiting other marine resources, in the shape of marine flora and minerals, is just beginning to be realised. We have an exclusive right to exploit our Exclusive Economic Zone extending to 2 million square kms. which is over half our land area.

The Indian Ocean and the seas on its north, namely the Arabian Sea and the Bay of Bengal, are vital to us, also from the view of our trade, specially external trade. Our ports handle over 100 million tonnes of this trade annually and our large and growing marchant navy needs to ply these waters freely in accordance with International laws. The freedom to navigate these waters in terms of international laws for peaceful purposes is of equal importance to all the littoral countries.

While because of our dedication to the cause of peace as well as our dedication to the cause of development, we have always advocated that the Indian Ocean should remain a zone of peace, the strategic location of these waters, their vast potential for yielding natural resources and the volume of trade that is carried across it have, unfortunately, resulted in new awakening of interest in this region by non-littoral countries. Not only is there an interest in the economic development in this region but also a strategic interest because, with improved ships and submarines, and the highly sophisticated weaponry and systems which are a part of today's arsenals, presence in these waters provides the capability of a sudden and effective military intervention in many of the countries of this region. In an era of increasing political tensions and localised conflicts, this has resulted in increased naval presence by non-littoral countries in the Indian Ocean. The threat that such increases pose to the peaceful intentions of countries such as ours is naturally a matter of concern to the public, to

this House, and to the Government alike.

We have been repeatedly endeavouring in diplomatic forums to ensure through our initiatives that the Indian Ocean be effectively retained as a zone of peace. Significant initiatives were taken for instance in the United Nation's Ad hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean as also within the frame work of the Non-Aligned Movement leading to the final declaration in the 7th Non-Aligned Summit in which the Non-Aligned countries reaffirmed their determination to continue their endeavour for the implementation of the 1971 UN resolution.

While diplomatic initiatives to prevent the emergence of tensions in this region will continues, Government are also ensuring that we are equipped to resist any encroachments on our sovereign rights in these waters and with this objective in view are upgrading the oprational capabilities of the Armed Forces in general and the Navy in particular, as it is on the Indian Navy that the primary responsibility for protecting these waters will devolve. This is being sought to be achieved by the induction of more surface and subsurface vessels, appropriate aircraft for maritime reconaissance, and by improving the weapons and other fitment of these platforms. Unfortunately, I am constrained by the requirements of national security from divulging details about our precise plans about this modernisation programme The House will be glad to know, however, that as compared to a mere 3 per cent of the Defence Budget in the sixties, the Navy's share of this budget has grown almost four fold, and over the last several years has risen to almost 12 per cent of the allocation for defence. To conclude, therefore, I must say that while we would wish that the Indian Ocean should remain a zone of peace in which the littoral countries may in accordance with international laws hope to reap the bounties of these waters, we are also in readiness to defend, if the need arises, our sovereign rights therein.

श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव (बिहार): मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है । हमें वक्तव्य की हिन्दी की प्रतिलिपि नहीं मिली है । जब तक हमें हिन्दी की प्रतिलिपि नहीं मिलती है तब तक मन्त्री जी का व्याख्यान बन्द किया जाए । हमें पहले हिन्दी की प्रतिलिपि उपलब्ध कराएं तब कार्यवाही चलाई जाए ।

डा० (श्रीमती) नाजमा हेपतुल्ला : कान में आला लगा कर सुन लीजिए । **(व्यवधान)**

श्री जसवन्त सिंह (राजस्थान) : मान्यवर, यह प्रश्न पहले भी उठ चुका है । सभापति जी द्वारा यह कालिंग अटेंशन आज स्वीकार नहीं हुआ है, यह शुक्रवार को स्वीकार हो गया था और शुक्रवार से ले कर आज सोमवार है, 12 बजे यह बहस शुरू हुई है तो माननीय सदस्यों को हिन्दी का वक्तव्य नहीं मिला है यह आपत्तिजनक बात है । यह पहली बार नहीं हो रहा है । **(व्यवधान)**

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, पता लगाते हैं । हिन्दी की बंट रही है । **(व्यवधान)** आपकी बात मानते हैं ।

श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव : उस दिन माननीय नेता-सदन ने हम लोगों को कहा था आगे से ध्यान रखेंगे । हम लोग उस दिन तो शान्त हो कर बैठ गये और फिर आज इस की पुनरावृति हुई है । आप कहते हैं कि हम बंटवा रहे हैं । तो क्या संविधान में हमें जो अधिकार है प्राप्त है उसको आप इस तरह से कहेंगे । ऐसा लगता है जैसे हम कोई भीख मांगते हों । यह भीख नहीं है हमारे संविधान में यह अधिकार हमें मिला हुआ है ।

हमारी नियमावलि में है। इस तरह हिन्दी की बात आएगी ? (**व्यवधान**) संविधान को फैंक दीजिए, नाश कर दीजिए, जला दीजिए, उसकी कोई मान्यता नहीं है। सत्ताधारी दल के लोग तो उपहास करने लगते हैं, कहते हैं कि कान में आला लगा लीजिए। मैं भी जानता हूं लेकिन संविधान की जो मान्यता है (**व्यवधान**)

श्री उपसभापति : हिन्दी की प्रतियां आ रही है, बंट रही है। मुझे लगता है कि 10-15 मिनट आने में देरी हो गई, अभी आपको मिल जाती है।

श्री श्रीधर वासुदेव धाबे : (महाराष्ट्र) : माननीय सदस्य ने ठीक कहा है। दोनों भाषाओं में एक साथ कापियां मिलनी चाहियें। (**व्यवधान**)

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है इसका ध्यान रखा जाएगा।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मान्यवर, भविष्य में ऐसी गलती की पुनरावृत्ति न हो। हिन्दी हमारी राष्ट्र-भाषा है तो उसका आचरण होना चाहिये। (**व्यवधान**)

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी (मध्य प्रदेश) : इस प्रकार की कोई व्यवस्था कभी आप देंगे ? तो उसके कारण निश्चित रूप से आगे सावधानी बरती जाये।

श्री उपभापति : मुझे लगता है कि पहुंचाने में थोड़ा आगे पीछे हो गया है नहीं तो साथ ही बंटनी चाहिए थी। अब बंट रही है।

DR. (SHRIMATI) NAJMA HEPTULLA: Sir I thank the Minister of Defence for giving a very extensive statement. I wish he had also supplied Hindi version so that our friends could have been able to read it.

Sir, declaration of the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, as the Minister said, is not being discussed for the first time. For over a decade it is being discussed at the national and international platforms, and only in last March the Lok Sabha extensively discussed the matter. This also indicates how important the matter is for the security of the country.

More than 120 warships equipped with the most sophisticated nuclear warheads are afloat in and around the Indian Ocean.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA (Bihar): Of which countries?

DR. (SHRIMATI) NAJMA HEPTULLA: Of so many countries. I am coming to which ones. I will give you the details. More than 37 ships of the United States Navy are afloat in the Indian Ocean with the base facility for the rapid deployment force at Diego Garcia, facilities in Egypt, Sudan, North Yemen, Turkey South Africa. And the Washington Administration is trying to improve its air-base facilities in northwest Australia with bombers equipped with nuclear warheads.

Sir, it is very unfortunate that there is a new arrangements between the American Administration and Sri Lanka which is a regional country on whose recommendation in 1971 United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution declaring the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. Sri Lanka is also a founder member of the non-aligned countries instead of solving its problems with New Delhi about the ethnic issue—Tamil speaking minorities are burning to United States, United Kingdom and Israel for help. It is very unfortunate that zionists have been given a

special section in the United States Embassy in Sri Lanka. This brings a danger to our door steps. Sir, I think, Sri Lanka has forgotten that these imperialists and zionists after creating havoc in Lebanon and Middle East are in search of new vistas and they found a very good place for their activity in Sri Lanka. Sir, due to the extensive presence and increased military activity by the United States in our area, other countries are also concentrating their naval ships in the Indian Ocean which is a very sensitive zone. The naval concentration by Soviet Union, United Kingdom, Germany, Israel, France and many other countries has increased the danger. Sir, due to the American interests in the Middle East, Pakistan has allowed America to use its air-base facility in the event of any hostility and the closure of strait of Hormuz which Iran has threatened to close. There is also going to be an agreement between America and Pakistan in the field of nuclear weaponry. The continued Iran-Iraq war is not showing any sign of settlement. The danger to strategic positions of strait of Hormuz, strait of Malacca and Suez Canal is enhancing. Both United Nations and the Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers' Conference in 1981 and then the summit conference, 1983 have expressed great concern about the happenings in Middle-East and South-Asia regions. They also expressed their concern on the part of the super-powers to nullify the idea of Indian Ocean a zone of peace. United States has been successful in sabotaging the Colombo Conference about the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. I am sure that America will also sabotage the laws of the Sea Conference in the near future.

Sir, today the war is not for the land resources. But war is escalating for the resources in the sea and under the sea-bed. The discovery of oil in the Bombay High has created prejudice in the world. As our Minister said in a statement, the discovery of nodules in our sea-beds and the tremendous wealth which we have in our ocean is no myth. We knew it from the olden times the "Samudra Manthan" of the ancient history. I am sure we need a "Brahma" to give us our "Ratnas" which are hidden in our ocean. Sir, we have 600 kilometres of coastline and with Andaman, Nicobar and Lakshadweep islands, 2.2 million sq. kilometres of area directly comes under New Delhi's administration. I do not think that the naval forces at our disposal and the Coast Guard are sufficient enough to protect the three important factors, the geostrategic, the geophysical and the geoeconomic regions.

I will now put a few questions to our hon. Minister. He has mentioned in his statement that the Government has taken great care to improve our navy and he cannot give the details to the House for reasons of security. But I will ask the hon. Minister: is he satisfied that the allocations which are made in our Seventh Five Year Plan—he was till recently the Minister for Planning—are sufficient to make our navy important enough and to have not only its presence but to make its presence felt? Has Government taken any positive action after the discussion of the matter about the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, in March last in the Lok Sabha? Does the Government propose to take up the matter of de-militarisation of the Indian Ocean at the forthcoming 39th General Assembly session of the United Nations, or to call an international conference regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the U.N. General Assembly Resolution and of the committee appointed by it and those of the Resolution of the Non-aligned Summit in 1983? Has Government any information about the Jack Anderson report regarding Pakistan giving airbase facilities to the U.S. in the event of any danger to the U.S. interests in the Gulf and in return Pakistan getting military aid and sharing of intelligence plus assistance and

[Dr. (Shrimati) Najma Heptulla]

training for nuclear technology? Is the Government thinking of having one unified governmental organisation to take care of the maritime activities? The Soviet Union has a co-ordinating mechanism for all maritime activities. The USA has a single agency to tackle the problem. Japan and other countries have substantially good coordination between industry and Government for exploitation of maritime wealth. Even Sri Lanka is creating a separate department for maritime affairs. Here, today the Ministry of Defence is responsible only for the guarding of the coast, and other Ministries are responsible for its exploitation. There is no coordination. This is a serious lacuna which must be removed, before different organisations try to go in different directions. Sir, there is need for our navy to make its presence felt in the area and to safeguard all our national interests, maritime interests, and the security of the country. The development of the country depends on the security of the country. I will end by saying the old saying: if you want peace, prepare for war.

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): Sir, the issue is the concentration of naval forces of big powers in the Indian Ocean. There is no contradiction nor any confusion that the danger is real, extremely serious and certainly poses a threat, a real threat to our sovereignty and unity, and failure to understand it will land us in disaster, particularly when one sees the way the Government is handling the problem, its refusal to see the US deception tactics. First, I do not understand the meaning of this line, "concentration of naval forces of big powers.'. I do not know why the Minister is not categorical about it, whether there is concentration of big powers or there is a super-concentration by one big power. This vagueness, equivocation or hesitation to come out with the blunt truth actually paralysed the anger and the consciousness of the people. When you go on repeating things which are false, then you cannot involve the people in your anti-imperialistic activity. In other words, you weaken the anti-imperialist, anti-neo-colonial activity by not telling the blunt, naked, truth to the people. As a matter of fact, I would repeat it, here in this House when Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee was the External Affairs Minister, in a similar Calling-Attention I pressed him, please state whether there is one military base in Indian Ocean or there are two military bases belonging to the two big powers, one Soviet Union and the other United States. I asked him in this House in 1979 and Mr. Vajpayee was frank enough to say there was no base belonging to the Soviet Union in the Indian Ocean. And till today that thing stands and there are no two basis in the Indian Ocean by two super-powers. There is one base, Diego Garcia, which has been now turned into one of the biggest naval bases in the world after turning out the citizens for a paltry sum of money. The port is being deepened, the bases are being expanded. Already there is a large number of planes fitted with missiles, with atomic warheads, and so on. So, my charge is this: So long as you go on misleading the people, your people will remain confused as to whether the danger is knocking at our door. The fight will ultimately not be fought only by the naval forces, however gallant they may be, or the air force or the infantry. The fight will ultimately have to be fought by the 700 million people of India. If you do not get them involved in your fight against imperialism, a few divisions under the great expert, Mr. Deo, will not be able to tackle the submarines which will be coming from Diego Garcia. This is the issue and you are evading it. What does it mean? Either you are not serious of what you are reading or you are not frank enough or you have been deceived by the American

super power. In the post-War situation, after the Second World War, who intervened when the leftist Government in Guatemala was overthrown in 1954? Then there was the American military intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965, then the invasion in the Bay of Pig. in Cuba during the time of Kennedy, then came the overthrow of the Allende regime in 1971, then the coup detat in Bangladesh. The first announcement of the coup detat was made not on the Dhaka radio but in Washington DC. The whole Pakistani military regime today survives not because the people are behind them, not even the army is behind them, because they are getting their total support from Mr. Reagan. All the reactionary regimes, all the military regimes, the anti-democratic regimes, around India, are drawing their support only from one source. Today we forget what Mao said right after the Second World War He said, "It is easier to fight imperialism because imperialism is standing today on one pillar, the United States, and knock the pillar, the entire imperialism will crash." So, it is no use pointing out; we know it. We know that intervention after intervention has been made openly, nakedly and crudely by the United States in total disregard of all the United Nation's theories or the United Nation's policies or the United Nation's preachings. And lastly came the naked intervention in the Caribbean Island of Grenada. At that time even their friendly allies, closest allies like the United Kingdom were not consulted and there was a storm over this in the House of Commons. Even Mrs. Thatcher expressed great regret and a Committee was appointed by the House of Commons to go into it. If you please see the reports of the Committee, you will see that they were fully critical of the way in which the intervention was carried out.

If Greneda can be invaded, if a non-communist regime like that of Allende was thrown out, If American vessels near Lebanon can bomb with impunity the city of Beirut, I do not know how long we have to wait to get the shelling from the American battleships, in Madras or in Calcutta or in Bombay or in Cochin. They will not do it directly. They will try to do it indirectly. That is their whole tradition. When I was in the United States there was an attempt to intervene in Korea and they used to say: Let books fight books. They will say: "Let Asians fight Asians; let Africans fight Africans; We will stay behind."

Three years ago there was shelling in some villages in Ceylon. Then in the 'Times of India' and in the 'Hindustan Times' the news appeard that the same day American frigate reached Colombo. Shelling of the citizens of Ceylon by an undemocratic regime and arrival of frigate from the United States—this is just not an accident. This building up of base by the United States is just not an accident. It is not an accident that some countries are now selling the latest sophisticated submarines to Bangladesh. So long as you go on harping 'Super Power', 'Super Power', you are weakening the Army and the people because you are not informing the people. This is a big charge. Why don't you come out with the blunt truth? I ask the Minister: Has the Soviet Union got the bases there? The Minister said about abundant natural resources. It was abundant natural resources which brought British imperialism to this country.

You were the Planning Minister. Is it not a fact that the South Korean trawlers and Japanese trawlers are found to be encroaching our areas? And you have done nothing about it. Is it not a fact that Indonesian trawlers are coming deep in the ocean near Andaman and Nicobar islands? You have not done anything. So, neither the coast is safe; nor the natural resources are safe; nor the border is safe. I do not know whether

[Shri Kalyan Roy]

you will be safe after January. Nobody can predict.

So, I charge you of deception and falling a prey to the pressures of America. Mrs. Heptulla mentioned America by name and I am grateful to her. She has come out with the blunt truth which the Minister is afraid of.

Is it not a fact that the battleships of the United States operate through the multi-national companies which are established here? They pass on the information and they come. You cannot fight the United States politically unless you fight them on the economic front. You cannot take a strong political line if you go to Washington to plead for IMF loan. These two things cannot go together.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am somewhat at a loss about the direction which this particular discussion has taken. I think there is need for me to reiterate some of the essential elements of this Calling Attention. What I want to indicate is that this motion talks about the "serious situation arising out of the concentration of naval forces of big powers in the Indian Ocean". While it is a matter of concern to all of us, the Mover of the Motion says that it poses a 'threat to the secruity of our country.' These are really the parameters of today's discussion. I had rather hoped that the honourable Minister would throw some light on these parameters in the statement that he has made in the House, that there would be an analysis of the security concerns and then the perceptions of the Government and, following upon all that, there would be an explanation of the Government's response to all that But I am still at sea despite the Minister's statement and despite the honourable initiator of the discussion. It seems that really it is a fact that we are actually at sea in matters concerning national security.

Sir, when we talk about the Indian Ocean—the Minister has suggested that the word "Indian" is derived from "India"—I would like to caution that not too long ago, Indonesia asked why Indian Ocean should not be called as "Indonesian Ocean". So, the name "Indian Ocean" does not and ought not to give us a kind of preperitorial right on the Indian Ocean. Oceans of the world are all free and in that as nations we have to assert only our national interests. But, if the whole concept of the national interest is derived as if the Indian Ocean is our territorial water, then we would be badly faulting whatever we are trying to search for as national security. When we talk about the Indian Ocean and its impact on India's security concerns, we are introducing an element which is much wider and extra-regional than the purely land-based security articulation to which we are used. As far as the Indian Ocean's impact on the national security is concerned, every global and regional imbalance and conflict will have a nexus with our national concerns and our security considerations. What is required in such a situation is precisely what the Government of India does not have and which is precisely what this statement does not have, conceptual clarity, efficiency and finesse in the practice of diplomacy, because diplomacy and security concerns are like Siamese Twins, they are the two faces of the same coin, and we need to have strategic flexibility, combined with tactical mobility. There was an element introduced here but the Minister's statement says nothing about it. My honourable friend, Shri Kalyan Roy, and others brought into the discussion the question of our national security concern in the context of the Indian Ocean. If there was any demonstration needed of the superpower weight in this region the Minister's statement and the responses

that have come up are really very good examples of it. This discussion is about India's national security, it is not about what the super power interests are in this region and it is precisely that point which I am trying to make, that is, unless India's security concerns are able to articulate themselves, express themselves, out of the bondage of super power interests, whether in the context of South-West Asia or in the context of the Indian Ocean, we will not be able to arrive at any kind of clarity of thinking. We are not prisoners of the super powers and we must categorically reject any theory which suggests that it is the super power interests which have a primacy of interest, which have primacy, in this region, that thesis we do not subscribe to. This debate does not lend itself to the absurdities of how many times you name the United States or how many times you name the Soviet Union. It is a well-known fact that there is a base in Diego Garcia, that it is an advanced base and the United States has it and it is also a well-known fact how the ring around the Indian Ocean came about, that it has a historical development how Diego Garcia came into being and how, in response to Diego Garcia, after the advent of Satellite-Launched Ballistic Mssiles, the SLBMS as they are called, because of there had to be a that response from the Soviet Union, etc. These are all well-known facts and these are the facts that go to determine what the situation in Indian Ocean situation is all about, and why it is important to us. Now, just reverse the map that we normally see. Don't say that the Indian peninsula is jutting into the Indian Ocean. Reverse the whole map, in your eyes or as you picture it, and if you see the weight of the Indian Ocean on the Indian peninsula, understand then why the Indian Ocean is important to us. Indian Ocean is not important to us merely because Diego Garcia is there or the Soviet Union has linkages with Syria or North Yemen, with Somalia, either with Egypt. You talk about Diego Garcia. U.S.S.R. wanted a base in Diego Suarz (*Interruptions*). From the same country. But this is reducing our national interest to an absurd debate, like a debate about and between super powers. We do not want them here. That is the point not whether you want the United States or you want the Soviet Union. However, I shall not take too much time on this point. The global, the super power conflict, has a nexus with our difficulties otherwise this debate would not make sense. Everybody is talking of the US presence, the Soviet presnce. The global weight of the super power interests is weighing us down even in this House, with the weight of their own national interest.

Sir, what then is the regional aspect? The Gulf, the continuing Israeli-Arab situation, the linkage between that and the deteriorating situation in Lebanon. Now, Sir, the Gulf is deteriorating. There is an open war, continuing for the last three years between Iraq and Iran. We sit across the waters, as it were, between that deteriorating situation in the Gulf and India. It does have a linkage with us, as indeed does the deterioration in South-West Asia. If the Soviet Union continues to sit in Afghanistan, irrespective of how you look at it, it will have an effect on our security.

Now, look at the local situation. What are the local factors; what are the local considerations, that we as a country have to take into account? Everybody talks only of the Arabian Sea. We must also recognize the importance of the Seven Degree Channel. We must recognize the importance of South-East Asia. We must recognize that the People's Republic of China as a developing naval power is going to come up in this region. We must recognize that we have an existing dispute with Bangladesh on New Moore Island. We must recognize that we have a dispute even with Burma. I will read out the name of that island. It is skipping me; it will

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

come to me later. We have a dispute with Burma on that island. Therefore, in local factors what are we talking of when we are talking of Indian interests, Indian security concern and Indian Ocean. Unless, therefore, we are able to sift out between the importation into our region—I will take only two minutes. Unless we are able to distinguish, and simultaneously establish a nexus, between the global, between the regional and the local, all this discussion about the Indian Ocean, and this very beautifully worded 'essay', are really meaningless. What are we talking about? We are talking about security concern. We are not talking about the beauty of marine wealth or the excellent under-water facilities that may be available. I am afraid this really reduce the seriousness of what we are talking. This kind of wooly schoolboyish essay that the hon. Minister has found fit to present to the Parliament makes a nonsense of a debate which really concerns national security aspects. (*Interruptions*).

DR. (SHRIMATI) NAJMA HEPTULLA (Maharashtra): To exploit our resources the British came to India and exploit our resources others are coming to...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will take only one minute, just one minute to quote a certain passage and go to my questions. This is a quotation from a very eminent and seasoned statesment:

> "A major war could came about much more readily by confrontation outside the main theatre of Central Europe, with each of the super powers tied to somewhat independent and unpredictable local and regional actors. so that such conflict could reach a point not intended by either super powers, in which one or the other takes a choice between local defeat and wider action...."

It is in the third world that what the Soviet Union calls the 'corelation of forces' can shift most markedly not only in the perception of the super powers themselves but in all their most responsible major allies. That is our major danger. It was my expectation, that there was something that the Minister would come up with. I will now seek a few clarifications on the Minister's statement.

We have a coastline of near about 8000 kms. We have 319 islands in the Andaman and Nicobar group and we have 18 islands in the Lakshadweep and Minicoy group. Protection of our territories is the Indian Navy's first task. I would ask the Minister: Protection is envisaged against what type of threat—is it amphibious assault that we apprehend? if so, from which quarter? The non-regional powers, the non-litoral powers, which seek to project their naval power in the Indian Ocean have strong navies. There are about 120 vessels belonging to the nonlittoral States. Even if it were assumed that politically it was possible that the littorals would arrive at one stand and pool their navies, we cannot match that strength. Therefore, in real, medium, short or long-term, what strategic thinking are you talking of? That is my second question. Thirdly, the honourable Dr. Najma Heptulla spoke about our sea resources. Our second maritime interest, therefore, in the sea is to look for the mineral and fish resources. In this there are two aspects: our access to such resources and denial of these resourcs to hostile elements. Do we have the capability for this? My next question relates to maritime trade, sea trade and maritime interests. We have about 400-odd vessels and our trade is roughly in the region of Rs. 25,000 crores. I may be faulted on the figure. How does Indian

Navy visualise safeguarding this? There had been a mention made in the context of Burma, Burma's long standing claim to Narcondam Island; there is also the aspect Seychelles, Mauritius, Maldives. These are some of the things the honourable Minister should throw light on. As far as Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is concerned, there was an initiative taken during NAM, but that initiative was abandoned during CHOGM. In the CHOGM conference of 1983 the initiative on the zone of peace was strangely a non-starter. Does the Government now intend taking any initiative in that respect so as to get it re-activited? Finally, what is the Government's thinking about the concept of zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia as different from the zone of peace? There is a distinction which I hope the Minister will recognise. What is the Government's assessment of the role of South Africa in the Indian Ocean? And if you permit me a concluding sentence, there is the internal factor. Outside of the internal factor, no action for external security by a nation can have any meaning if that which we strive for internally, that is, if we lack credibility internally, we cannot carry conviction about it externally. Thank you very much.

SHRI NEPALDEV BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): Sir, thank you very much for permitting me to speek on this serious issue. And through you, Sir, I want to thank the hon. Minister for this intensive statement and also the most confusing one. I do not know whether his intention is to confuse this House or he himself is confused regarding this matter because the statement is like that. The statement is intensive, that means it is lengthy. But it is also confusing. And I do not know what exactly is his intention. But it appears that he has successfully confused some of our friends.

Sir, so far as the statement is concerned, it is talking about the super powers and that this serious situation has arisen because of the presence of the super powers. But I want to know from the hon. Minister, through you, Sir, what does he mean exactly by super powers? There are so many States, there are so many countries. Why is he not taking the names? I also agree with Mr. Kalyan Roy. Why is the hon. Minister not taking the names of the imperialist countries, those who are trying to destabilise our country? They are having their bases near Diego Garcia. It is not only Diego Garcia, Sir. So many incidents have happened during the last two or three years. And we can name them. We are not serious about it. We are not taking their name. We are trying to confuse our people saying super powers and countries like that. Why are we not taking the name? That is my question. And it is obvious that whatever seriousness has arisen in the Indian Ocean area, it is because of an imperialist country, and that imperialist country is trying to control the whole region as such from that place. If this is the beginning of the problem, then the second thing and the third thing would follow, and that can be explained and that can be answered. But, Sir, this its totally confusing. See the role of the Americans there and here in Punjab and in Assam. They are successfully continuing this. And we are not taking their name. The Government has no guts to take their names. My question is very simple: Why are we not pointing out them?

Sir, Dr. Najma Heptulla was asking about the allotment of money from the Plan for the Navy to pro-

[Shri Nepaldev Bhattacharjee]

tect our land. So far as our Party is concerned, we do not believe that a handful of soldiers there can meet this threat. They can fight heroically but they cannot save this huge area if there is any threat from outside. Our Military and our other Forces will save the country. They can protect for the time being but not ultimately. So, one the one hand we have to equip our Forces. On the other, we should also equip them ideologically by supplying them with correct news and facts. You are not equipping our countrymen with that information. You are supplying this sort of a statement where you are not saying what exactly is the reason for this situation that has arisen. After a few days, things may happen as they happened in Afghanistan. I am saying this because it will help you to understand the situation. From Pakistan they are giving Rs. 50 crores to the rebel Afghans. And this is being supported by the American Senator, Mr. Charles Wilson. They say that it can be given to the rebels because they are fighting for their own cause and what the harm was in it. I am telling this because they have openly come out in the press saying, "We are only helping the rebels against the Afghanistan Government." But they are also secretly helping the rebels against our Government, against the Government of this country. Tomorrow they may spell out, "We are helping the rebels. What is the harm in it?" So, Sir, before hand, we must get ready. We must tell our people what is really dangerous for us. I am sorry to hear from hon. Member, Mr. Jaswant Singh, that this is not related to any country, this is absolutely our matter. But our matter comes from outside. Whatever we are; we can solve our problems in our country. Sir, I say that the danger that is coming to us from outside, if we do not name it, if we do not pinpoint it, if we do not tell who is responsible for all these things, then really it wil be a crime on our part to suppress this thing and hide this thing. We should not do it. My request to the hon. Minister is that we should come out with the truth and say wherefrom this danger to us comes and who is causing this danger. It cannot be confused by saying that some 35 are on this side and some 40 are on that side. It cannot be confused like that. So, I believe that the Minister will name them who are causing this danger. It is understandable if a Hindu wife does not name her husband who is beating her every night, but why is not the Minister taking the name of the USA who are causing this danger. Is he afraid of the IMF or anybody else, I do not know. It is understandable in the case of a Hindu wife not to take the name of her husband but it is not understandable in the case of a Government, which can really take the name. (*Time bell rings*). So, Sir, my concrete question to the Minister is that he should come out with the concrete name, the name of the imperialist Government, from which this danger is coming to us from this region so that not only the Minister alone or his Ministry alone or the Government alone knows it but the whole nation should know it so that they can fight it back in future. That is my request. I believe the statement can be corrected that way and this information given to us. Thank you.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Tamil Nadu): Sir, this House and the Government and the people of India are very much concerned with the Indian Ocean. As Indian Ocean is in our neighbourhood, its security and anything which happens in the Indian Ocean will affect our sovereign rights and also the rights of those countries which are washed by the

Indian Ocean like the African countries and the Gulf countries, and so on. In the year 1971, Sir, a resolution was passed in the United Nations declaring for the first time that the Indian Ocean should be a zone of peace. No other part in the world, no other region in the world, no other Ocean in the world had the benefit of a resolution of the United Nations. Only the Indian Ocean and Indian Ocean alone was referred to, was discussed, and a resolution was passed that the Indian Ocean being a strategic area, where two super-powers are operating, should be declared as a Zone of peace. The security of India, the sovereignty of India are paramount to us. On this question there is no difference of opinion on this side of the House or on the other side of the House. We are one on this. I went through the statement of the Minister. Perhaps in his anxiety to give us more information about this, he has strayed away quite from the main issue. The main issue is the issue of security. Of late there has been heavy concentration of submarines, vessels, sophisticated weapons of war in this Ocean by both America and the Soviet Union.. I would have been happier if the Minister had given certain details about the concentration of these modern weapons, modern vessels, the type of vessels, the type of weapons, the type of activities of these two Super Powers that they are indulging in, in the Indian Ocean. Except getting certain information from the papers and from the magazines, we do not know what the latest position is in regard to these preparations.

1 P.M.

We all agree in this House that there is both concentration and confrontation between these two Super Powers, concentration of weapons, concentration of vessels and also the confrontation. And we are so near confrontation. And we are so near the Gulf, the Gulf countries, the Middle-East, where the flames of war are raging. This has made the Indian Ocean more explosive. Therefore, even now, I would like the Minister to tell us, the details of the latest situation in the Indian Ocean, the equipments, the type of activity that these two Super Powers are indulging in. He has been rather very wavy in naming the Super Powers; I do not know why he should. This House is very much concerned that no Super Power should be here. I do not make any distinction between the Soviet Union and America. Both are there vying with each other and the peace of this zone has been disturbed for so many years and this should not become serious and more explosive.

Sir, after the non-aligned meet, except one bald statement here, there has been no indication what the Government of India has been doing in this regard. To me, there seems to be a lull and a pause, a diplomatic pause, you may say, a lull in our efforts to move international agencies, United Nations in particular, and to take up the matter with other littoral States, in Africa and elsewhere, to create a climate of opinion that these Super Powers should not be there in the Indian Ocean. And so long as these two Super Powers are in the Indian Ocean, they are violative of our sovereignty. It should be made clear that they violate our sovereignty; they violate our security; they also violate the security and sovereignty of littoral States and they disturb the peace. In any case, therefore, we should tell them that so long as they are there concentrating their power in this area, we regard it as an unfriendly act, and declare it a hostile act. Whether the Government of India is thinking in these terms, I do not know. It is a very very serious and a sensitive issue, I know. We should also not indulge in bravado; we should be very realistic and we should take up the matter with other littoral States; if need be, we may even call a conference of

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

these littoral States in Delhi or elsewhere and declare their activities, activities of both the Soviet Union and America, in this zone as a hostile act.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think there are three more speakers. We can continue after lunch.

सदन की कार्यवाही दो बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है ।

The House then adjourned for lunch at four minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at three minutes past two of the clock, **The Vice-Chairman (Shri Syed Rahmat Ali)** in the Chair.

श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हिंद महासागर में महाशक्तियों के बढ़ते हुए प्रभाव पर सदन में हम चर्चा कर रहे है और इस पर काफी बातें बताई गयी हैं। सरकार की ओर से भी जो इसमें दिया गया है तो किसी का नाम वगैरह नहीं बताया गया है। कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने यह कहा कि सरकार को उन देशों का नाम बताना चाहिये। सरकार की ओर से यह भी कहा गया कि हम निर्गुट राष्ट्रों की एक शक्ति बनाना चाहते हैं तथा उसके जरिये कुछ करना चाहते है।

सर्वप्रथम मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि विश्व भर के भिखमंगों का एक सम्मेलन हुआ था और उन भिखमंगों ने अपने सम्मेलन में प्रस्ताव पास किया कि इस दुनियां से पूंजीवाद को मिटा देने के लिये हमें सक्रिय होना है, एक जुट हो जाना है, सबको मिल कर एक जुट होना है। लेकिन जब भिखमंगों का सम्मेलन समाप्त हुआ तो एक-एक भिखमंगा किसी पूंजी वाले के पास गया और उससे कहा कि हमें थोड़ा दान दे दो। किसी ने कहा कहीं मंदिर बनाऊंगा किसी ने कहा मस्जिद बनवाऊंगा, किसी ने कहा तालाब बनवाऊंगा और किसी ने कहा स्कूल बनवाऊंगा। इस पर लोगों ने कहा इनसे मांग रहे हो तो फिर कैसे चलेगा। उन्होंने कहा लेते वेते नहीं हैं यह तो दान ले रहे हैं, सहायता के रूप में ले रहे हैं। तो दुनिया के ये जो निर्गुट सम्मेलन करने वाले राष्ट्र हैं। यह भिखमंगे लोग और यह बड़ी ताकत के खिलाफ बैठ कर के कहते हैं कि इनके खिलाफ हमको कुछ करना है और भारत को कहते हैं कि यह अगुवागिरी करे जोकि भिखमंगों का शिरोमणि है।

हम इस संसद् में बैठ कर के—अपने को जब मैं कहता हूं, तो शर्म से मेरा सिर झुक जाता है कि उन भिखमंगों का सरदार कौन है? तो भारत झुकेगा अपने विकास काम के लिये, फिर उसी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्रा-कोष से हो, तो कहां से हो, पी० एल० से हो या सी० एल० से हो, कौन-कौन संस्था के जरिये, अमरीका के आगे, फ्रांस के आगे, रूस के आगे, कभी विमान के लिये, कभी मिग के लिये कभी मिराज के लिये, कभी किसी के लिये। दुनियां की बड़ी शक्ति तो स्वयं अपने विकास के लिये स्वयं सुरक्षा के लिये, अपने किसी काम-काजों के लिये तो दुनियां की इन महाशक्तियों के आगे यह बड़े-बड़े लोग अपने देश के विकास के लिये अपने घुटने टेकते है, उनसे भीख मांगते हैं, उनके विभिन्न स्रोतों से उनसे पैसा लेते हैं, तो यह कैसे रोकेंगे?

इस तरह हमारा इन महाशक्तियों के खिलाफ बोलने में हमारा रोल वैसे

ही लगता है, जैसे एक लोमड़ी होती है जानवर, वह अपने मालिक के आगे दुम हिलाया करती है--हम चाहे जितने दिज हांक लें, लेकिन इस महाशक्ति रूस और अमरीका के खिलाफ हिन्दुस्तान हो या निर्गुट सम्मेलन में जो राष्ट्र वाले लोग हैं, इनमें शक्ति नहीं है कि बुलंद आवाज में बोल सकें क्योंकि अमरीका और रूस की बड़ी शक्ति के आगे यह लोमड़ी के जैसे अपनी दुम हिलाने लगते हैं। जब इन पर कभी संकट के बादल मंडराते हैं, तो उनसे सहायता लेने के लिए दौड़ते हैं।

हिंद महासागर में जो बड़ी शक्तियों का प्रभाव बढ़ रहा है और इनको रोकना है, उसको शांति क्षेत्र घोषित करना है, तो हिंद महासागर के चारों किनारे जो राष्ट्र हैं, उन राष्ट्रों की क्या चिंता है, उनकी क्या समस्या है, उन राष्ट्रों की समस्याओं को समझना, उनकी चिंता की समझना उनके कारण के निदान के लिये भारत के पास में कोई नीति है, कोई आपके पास में विचार है, कोई आपने इस दिशा में पहल की है? हिंद महासागर के किनारे किनारे बसने वाले जो छोटे-छोटे देश हैं, उनकी क्या समस्या है, क्या चिंता है, सुरक्षा के सवाल में, विकास के सवाल में, अन्य सवालों में और वहां चाहे अमरीका या रूस आए--यह दोनों बड़ी शक्तियां हैं, है, मैं मानता हूं कि कभी-कभी मौके पर रूस हमारा मददगार रहा है और इसलिए अगर रुस मददगार रहा है, तो हमें इस बात की खुशी रहती है और रुस के प्रति हमारे अंदर में दृष्टिकोण रहते हैं, मौके पर वह हमारे काम आ जाता है, लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि अमरीका काम आ जाए तो अमरीका तोप तान दे। तो अमरीका कहता है कि हम इसलिए तोप ताने हुए हैं कि रुसी साम्यवाद को रोकेंगे और रुस अपनी तोप इसलिए बांधे हुए है कि वह कहता है कि हम अमरीका के पूंजीवाद, विस्तारवाद और साम्राज्यवाद की नीति को रोकेंगे। तो एक अमरीका के साम्राज्यवाद को रोकने के लिए दुनिया को तोप दिखा रहा है और एक साम्यवाद को रोकने के लिए दुनिया को तोप दिखा रहा है और सम्पूर्ण दुनिया को दो भागों में बांट करके रुस और अमरीका उस पर शासन करना चाहते हैं और दुनिया के अंदर यह हिंद महा सागर के अंदर भी तनाव पैदा करके और युद्ध की परिस्थिति पैदा करके, जो उनके हथियार निकम्मे हो जाते हैं, उन निकम्मे हथियारों को सिवाए इन देशों के हाथ में बेचने के इनका कोई धंधा नहीं है।

इसलिए महाशक्तियों में दोनों अपराधी हैं इस मामले में, कोई दुनिया का हित चाहने वाला नहीं है, हमारा हित इस मामले में चाहने वाला कोई नहीं है। तो भारत सरकार की सब से बड़ी जिम्मेदारी है कि सब से बड़ी जनसंख्या के हिसाब से, दुनिया में ताकत के हिसाब से, इनकी जिम्मेदारी बनती थी, मैं समझता हूं कि भारत की सरकार की ओर से इस दिशा में अभी कोई सक्षम प्रयास नहीं हुआ है। क्या आज अगर वहां जुटे हैं, तो हिंद महासागर के किनारे-किनारे जो बसे राष्ट्र हैं, उनको इनसे बड़ा संकट है, लेकिन यह खुद तो इन दोनों के खेमें में बंटे हुए हैं, कोई रुस के खेमें में है, कोई अमरीका के खेमें में हैं, कोई अमरीका के पास जाता है और कोई रूस के पास जाता है और फिर कोई अमरीकन प्रभाव को बढ़ाना चाहता है, तो कोई एशियन प्रभाव को बढ़ाना चाहता है। कभी अमरीका शक्तिशाली होता है तो अमरीका से जुड़े हुए

[श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव]

जो हैं, उनके मन में बड़ा तूफान, समुद्र में जैसे लहरें उठती हैं, हिंद महासागर में वैसे ही अमरीका के बढ़ते हुए प्रभाव को देख कर के अमरीका के जो मित्र हैं, उनके मन में तूफान उठते हैं, लहरें उठती हैं कि अमरीका का दबदबा बढ़ रहा है, तो वहां तो सब से जुड़े हुए हैं, अब एटमिक शक्ति बढ़ती है, जो उनके अंदर भी समुद्र की लहरें उठती हैं कि रूसी प्रभाव बढ़ रहा है।

तो इस तरह से अगर जो हिंद महासागर के पास बसने वाले और खाड़ी में बसने वाले जो मुल्क हैं, इन सबों की क्या समस्या हैं, उनको विश्वास में लेना और फिर उनका अवस्था रूप से संगठन बनाना और संगठन बना करके अपने देश को मजबूत करने के लिए यह, सब कार्य करेंगे नहीं तो यह बड़ी शक्तियां हिंद महासागर को अशांत कर रही हैं।

तो मैं सरकार से जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या सरकार इस दिशा में कुछ कर सकेगी? जबकि मैं जानता हूं कि कुछ नहीं कर सकेगी क्योंकि हमको भी तो कहीं न कहीं से गेहूं, चावल मंगाना पड़ेगा, कुछ न कुछ मंगाना पड़ेगा। नहीं कुछ मंगाना पड़ेगा तो उनका जो बिल्कुल खत्म हुआ है टैंक और तोप है वही कुछ लाना पड़ेगा। ऋण में नहीं मिलेगा तो दान में ही लाना पड़ेगा। बहन, जी, "मांगना काम है छोटे का भिखमंगे न आदर पाते हैं। हैं, भगवान भी बौना बनते हैं, जब दान मांगने जाते हैं।"

आप.... हम तो भिखमंगे हैं ही, 40 लाख टन गेहूं पिछले साल भी मंगाया है विदेश से अब भी कहते हो भिखमंगे नहीं हैं। तो ऐसे लगता है जैसे कि शुतुर-मुर्ग आंख मूंद करके बालों में सर को घुसा ले और कहे कि कोई आंधी तूफान तूफान दुनिया में आया ही नहीं। तो हम ऐसे अपनी स्थिति को बनाए हुए हैं। इसलिए भारत सरकार इस मामले में पहल करे और इस दिशा में भारत सरकार क्या कर सकती है इसको बता दे और अपनी नौसेना को इन्होंने कहा कि हम मजबूत करने के लिए यह कर रहे हैं। तो आप अपनी नौसेना को अपने देश की सुरक्षा करने के लिए सीमा सुरक्षा करने के लिए और अपनी नौसेना को मजबूत करने के लिए खुद अपनी ताकत से और अपने बलबूते पर अपनी नौसेना को इतना मजबूत कर रहे हैं कि आप भी अपनी नौसेना को मजबूत करने के लिए कहीं न कहीं विदेश से हथियार खरीद रहे हैं, मांग रहे हैं खरीद रहे हैं और खरीदना है तो जहां से आप हथियार ले रहे हैं, खरीद रहे हैं, जो आपको दे रहे हैं क्या उसके खिलाफ में आपकी कोई नैतिक सत्ता है, नैतिक बल है? क्या उनके साथ कोई ललकार कर बात सकते हैं और उनको कोई चुनौती दे सकते हैं।

तो सारी बातें भाई जसवन्त सिंह जी जब बोल रहे थे तो इन्होंने बड़ी बारीकी से कही, माननीय सदस्यों ने बारीकी से सवालों को उठाया है,.....(**व्यवधान**) मैं ज्यादा समय सदन का नहीं लेते हुए,.....(**व्यवधान**) मेरा हर सवाल इसी में है और **सौ** सवाल का एक सवाल मैंने कह दिया। मैं चाहता हूं कि सरकार इस हिन्द महासागर को शांत क्षेत्र बनाने के लिए उसके किनारे बसे हुए तमाम मुल्कों को और खाड़ी के मुल्कों को आपस में विश्वास में ले करके उनकी चिंता और उनकी समस्याओं को समझ करके, उनका निराकरण करने के लिए इनके पास कौन सी नीति है, जो ठोस मजबूत और कारगर कदम उठाए जिससे इन निर्गुट राष्ट्र जो हैं, वे सभी दृष्टिकोण से,

आर्थिक राजनीतिक, सामाजिक और सभी दृष्टिकोण से सबल, सक्षम और मजबूत तथा शक्तिशाली बन सकें, जिससे कि इन बड़ी ताकतों पर दबाव दे सकें और इनके दबाव का कुछ असर भी हो सके ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED RAHMAT ALI): Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy. Not there. Shri Suresh Kalmadi.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI (Maharashtra) Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am happy with the statement of the Minister so far as appreciation of the problem is concerned. The hon. Minister has given a statement about the new situation arising from the Bombay High where there is an oil production of over Rs. 5000 crores annually. The trade is about 100 million tonnes, which is at the cost of about 20,000 crores. Also there is a 7000 kilometer long coastline. But, Sir, one part of the statement which is misleading is about the Defence budget and the allocation to Navy from the Defence budget. He has said that it has grown from 3 per cent in the '60s to 12 per cent as of today. Sir, it is true that in the '60s our Navy was born almost and it was 3 per cent at that time. But in the last 10 years the budget of Navy has remained about 11 to 12 per cent. This is a fact that this 11.8 per cent of the Defence budget over the period of last 10 years is far below the rquirements for facing such a strong challenge in the Indian Ocean. Out of the Defence budget of Rs. 6,800 crores, the share of the Novy is Rs. 809 crores. We must analyse what the Nevy does with this 809 crores. The pay and allowances account for Rs. 119 crores, the transport accounts for Rs. 14 crores, the stores account for Rs. 305 crores, works account for Rs. 31 crores and miscellaneous is Rs. 31 crores. So, Rs. 503 crores goes on this. For land and construction it is Rs. 58 crores. For the navel fleet the budget is only Rs 220 crores. So, this is the capital allotment for the purpose of says this. We have asked Russia for four Foxtrot submarines, two Tristar cruisers, three Kashin missile desships, for building of ships. Sir, you will be surprised to know that in the current budget the allotment for the Mazagon Docks has been reduced to Rs. 32 crores. That means, over one year's period they have reduced Rs. 15 crores on one project alone. It was Rs. 47 crores last year. This time it has been brought down to Rs. 32 crores I do not know why.

Sir, what is the situation in the Indian Ocean militarily? Other friends talked about the political aspect, but I am talking only about the military aspect. There are 14 major US warships near the Gulf which includes the Kitty Hawk, an aircraft carrier which has about 77 aircraft abroad, and one dozen warships in Diego Garcia. Also, Sir, you are aware that the runway at Diego Garcia is being extended and strengthened to take in B-52 bombers as well. The Soviets may not have a base in that area, but definitely they have over 21 warships in this area Also, Australia is increasing its military presence in the area. Sir, what steps are we taking to counter all that that is going on our coastline?

During the recent visit of General Ustinov, the Soviet Defence Minister, I think they have not told us about the outcome, because in this country defence matters are totally secret. In all other countries of the world, defence is thoroughly debated. In the United States, for example, whether to make the MX missile or not there will be national debate and then only then go in for it. But here it is kept absolutely secret to cover up all the lapses the Government has made in the Defence Ministry and so, nothing ever comes out—and this has been the tradition in this country. It is very very unfortunate. Before we purchase or make these, it should be thrown open to Parliament and the public for a national debate

Anyway, I have got these figures from Jane's Fighting Ships which

[Shri Suresh Kalmadi]

says this. We have asked Russia for four Foxtrot submarines, two Tristar cruisers, three Kashin missile destroyers, mine-sweepers, etc. Sir, we are today, aircraft carrier-wise, badly off. Our Vikrant is fit to be kept in a museum and nothing else. Our submarine position as of today, I think, is that we have got just eight Foxtrot type submarines which we acquired from USSR in the 70s. Now they have taken a decision to build two 1500 type submarines and acquire two from West Germany. I think this is absolutely wrong because, with whatever we have got now, for these four or five submarines we will have to wait till 1987. But what up to 1987? I think we should have gone in for the 1500 type immediately so that we would have something on hand. We should definitely think of 1990s. What are we going to do? We must have our indigenous infrastructure for that. Unfortunately, Government has done no planning whatso ever. Sir, definitely this type 155 will match the Exocet which the Pakistan Navy has got today, but we have to think in terms of the 1990s.

Sir, so far as navel aircraft are concerned, and also whether it is submarines or destroyers or minesweepers, aircraft carriers and where other aircraft are concerned, I would like to say, let us not have just one source only to get all the equipment because one day if by chance—God forbid—that source is cut off, we will be in a very bad position. We must have three or four different sources of supply and it must be borne in mind by the Governmnet in view of the ever-changing political scene all around the world. As far as navel aircraft are concerned, they have Sea Harriers and Sea Kings but they are just not good enough to match the threat in the Indian Ocean which has, as I just said, about 188 aircraft. And what are we going to do to counter it? One step which has been taken by the Government I definitely hail and that is the setting up of the Southern Command in the Air Force at Trivandrum recently which, I think, is a step in the right direction. I am sure the Navel Force would get a boost as far as that is concerned. But what about modern aircraft? As far as Mirage is concerned, you are aware that the Government failed to exercise the option of producing 110 Mirage aircraft in the country. They have gone in for 40 Mirage aircraft only and now they are turning to Russia for MiG-29. Sir, everybody is aware that MiG-29 does not have Electronic Counter Measure, which the Air Force is unhappy about. Mirage was the best aircraft in the world in the stage of production, and it is very unfortunate that at this moment we have switched over to Soviet MiG-29, which still the Government of the Soviet Union has not been able to produce in their country. This is going to create a lot of problems. As far as Mirage is concerned, a small quantity of 40 with the rate of accidents and the sort of maintenance that we have, I do not think, is going to go a long way. It is very sad that we have not exercised the option to produce Mirage.

About training of pilots in the Navy, you will be surprised to know that 900 pilots will be required by 1990, but most of the training of the pilots is undertaken in the flying clubs—civil flying clubs—of Delhi, Hyderabad and Jodhpur, which is very sad. They should have their own training establishments. And for training they are flying Pushpak. Nowhere in the world are pilots being trained in Pushpak. So the facilities in the Air Force should be expanded so that the training of Naval pilots can take place there. This is a major defect in the training system. I do not know why they have not gone into this aspect of the thing.

Sir, we heard that because of new situation, the Government has created a Coast Guard section of the

Navy. I would like to know what exactly has been done so far as the Coast Guard plan, which was approved in January, is concerned. What steps have been taken by the Government? I know one thing, that Dornier is about to join the Coast Guard, Dornier is a latest transport aircraft we have got from Russia and it is....

AN HON MEMBER: He is spilling out his knowledge. It is a German aircraft. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: Dornier is a latest German aircraft. That is right. I am very sorry. AN-32 is also joining the Navy. I do not know whether it has joined. The pilots have objected to AN-32 because of the strong vibrations inside which is distracting to the pilot. I would like to know whether they are thinking in terms of AN-32 being used in the Coast Guard.

Now, Sir, I would like to know if the Naval Headquarters have suggested to the Ministry of Defence for doubling of the strength of the Indian Navy and also for recruitment of another 5,000 personnel.

And, Sir, my last question is: what additional facilities are you going to provide to make Navy more attractive so that the cream of the youth can join the Navy? Because right now the youth of the country, when they go to the Navy, want to join the Merchant Navy; and you are not getting the right class of people to join the Indian Navy. So I would like to know from the Government what steps the Government is going to take to attract the cream of the youth of the country and to see that we have a strong Navy with good personnel manning the best equipment.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I respectfully submit that the subject of this motion has nothing to do with foreign policy or the initiatives on the diplomatic front that India has taken. The whole object of this motion is to draw the attention of the hon. Defence Minister to the security problems which have been created by the sinister developments in the Indian Ocean.

The hon. Defence Minister has mentioned various factors to show that the Indian Ocean is so vital to India. So far so good. But I respectfully submit, Sir, if those factors alone are valid for our sharp reaction to these developments, then, those factors should be good enough to make all the oceans in the world zones of peace.

The whole question is why our reaction was so sharp to this whole process of the militarisation of the Indian Ocean which started with the establishment of a naval base by the United States in Diego Garcia. The reason, Sir, is that the entire history of the colonial powers in this part of the world has been linked up with the prediminance of the naval power of the colonial countries in the Indian Ocean. It is because of this link-up between the naval powers who were colonial in nature and who were able to colonise these areas that our reaction against the return of the naval strength of the imperialistic powers into this region had to be very strong and sharp, and it was justifiably so.

I respectfully submit that the question is whether our perception has been justified by the subsequent events. It has been more than justified. It was followed by a new concept developed by the United States of employment of the rapid deployment force near the Persian Gulf. It has now been followed, and I have repeatedly said it on the floor of this hon. House, by a conscious and deliberate policy of the United States to encircle India for the purpose of destabilisation of India and scuttling her policy of non-alignment. It is in

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

pursuance of this policy, we should not forget, that the United States is seeking naval bases apart from Diego Garcia in Sri Lanka at Tincomalee, in Bangladesh at Chittagong and in Pakistan also. Fortunately, these developments have not yet fructified. But we cannot omit to take note of them. They are the developments which are the on going process which started with the establishment of the naval base in Diego Gercia. Imperialism, Sir, has the habit of coming back through the back doors and the front doors, and we cannot close our eyes to our tragic history, how the domination of the naval powers in the Indian Ocean led to the enslavement of these countries in this part of the world. It is this security threat which we have to bear in mind when we talk of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. But this is one aspect.

The other aspect, Sir, is the immediate threat. The immediate threat, so far as the navy is concerned, comes to us from the designs of the military rulers of Pakistan. We cannot forget that while we are considering the security requirements of India in the Indian Ocean—that creates a dilemma for our Defence Ministry, for our naval experts—so far as Pakistan is concerned, we have to develop a four dimensional navy, a navy which has preponderence of strength on the surface, under the surface of the ocean, which is in a position to operate on the sea and also on the beaches.

But so far as this threat from the imperialistic forces is concernned, our navy by the very nature of our resources has to be developed on the defensive lines, and in this regard I would like to mention that in 50s and 60s when the Soviet Union was not in a position to take on the United States navy in naval battles, it had concentrated itself on the defence, on the protection and security of its shores, and for that purpose it had developed the submarine fleet of the Soviet navy at the cost of other wings of the navy. It had to. So, I respectfully submit, Sir, the problem that is facing India today is this so far as the threat from the imperialistic forces is concerned, we have to concentrate on the defence wing of the Indian Ocean. That means the submarine fleet. But so far as the Pakistan is concerned, we have to develop preponderance of strength in all four dimensions of the Indian navy. Therefore, Sir, I would like to ask the Hon'ble Defence Minister, will he be pleased to consider this basic problem which is facing the Indian navy today—the problem of reconciliation of the requirements of the Indian navy for Pakistan and forces of imperialism. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED RAHMAT ALI): Mr. Satyanarayan Reddy.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the whole question of Indian Ocean has been discussed many times in this House and also in the Consultative Committee meetings attached to the Ministry of External Affairs. Repeatedly we have brought to the notice of the Government of India that the concept of making Indian Ocean a zone of peace should be pursued vigorously with the concerned littoral countries and also those countries which have really wished that India Ocean should become a zone of peace. These super-powers- United States and the Soviet Union are mainly interested to make their presence in the Indian Ocean by inducting very sophisticated submarines in the region. In this connection, I would like to quote from the Quarterly Journal of the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (Jan—March, 1982):

"In a Report titled 'United States Foreign Policy Objectives and Oveaseas

Military Installations' prepared by the Congressional Research Service for the US Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 1979 it has been clearly stated:

The US has both a conventional and perhaps a strategic nuclear military interest in the Indian Ocean region. Military objectives for US conventional forces include the capability to: (1) protect the US economic interests in the Persian Gulf region; (2) employ or threaten forces in support of US diplomatic objective in the Middle East; (3) secure the Indian Ocean air and sea routes against harassment or interdiction; (4) intervene in support of other objectives in the littoral; and related to all of these; and (5) balance Soviet forces in the region and attain superiority in crisis. The United States also possesses a potential strategic nuclear military objective of deploying when necessary or convenient, ballistic missile submarines (SSBN's) targeted on the U.S.S.R."

This is the objective of the foreign policy of the United States Government. Likewise Soviet Union, China, West Germany and France have got their own interests. I also quote further from the above Journal:

"China and France also become potential factors in this game of SSBN deployment. China has only two nuclear-propelled submarines neither of which has been tried out in the oceans. .. France has a 5,000-km range M-20 submarine missile and deploys four missile submarines."

So, Sir, all these countries are interested in their presence in the Indian Ocean. I would like to know from the Hon'ble Defence Minister what is the country-wise strength of naval presence in the Indian Ocean? What steps the Government of India has taken to meet the threat posed in the Indian Ocean?

Of course, we have passed resolutions at the Non-Aligned Conference and Commonwealth Conference asking these superpowers to refrain from being present in the Indian Ocean to maintain it as a zone of peace. But nothing has been fructified. The conference that was proposed to be held at Colombo was also postponed. I would like to know whether any new initiative has been taken by the Government of India to have this conference as early as possible. If not, what are the obstacles? Has the Government of India convinced the USA about the need to have this conference as early as possible? I do not think that the Soviet Union has any objection. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union has expressed its willingness and supported this idea. So I would like to know from the Defence Minister what steps or what new initiatives have been taken to meet this threat and also to have this conference as early as possible. Thank you.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very happy that so many hon. Members have taken such keen interest not only in the Indian Ocean being maintained as a zone of peace but also in a large number of items which normally, I thought, only those who have retired from the army might be knowing. But I was myself surprised that some of the hon. Members, who had nothing to do with the army, have taken keen interest in this and have gone into details as to how best we will be able to protect our national interests.

Sir, the statement which I have given, though some of the hon. Members were pleased to call it by different names in different ways according to their own wishes, summarises in a nutshell the position obtaining in the Indian Ocean. The fact of the matter is that we are vitally interested in seeing that we succeed in maintaining peace in the Indian Ocean. Not only from the point of view of global strategy, but in our own national interest, it is necessary that we should succeed in this. We have the resolution of the U.N. General Assembly of 1971, and thereafter it is the Ad-hoc Committee of the U.N. Assembly which is going deep into the matter in order to see that the resolution does not remain a mere pious hope, but that we are able to implement whatever the world conference has decided. But,

[Shri S. B. Chavan]

as hon. Members will definitely appreciate, these are matters which have to be pursued at the diplomatic level, irrespective of the fact that we may or may not succeed within the stipulated time. These are matters where we cannot possibly lay down a time-table that we should pursue this through the diplomatic channel up to a point and thereafter we might think in terms of having some other kind of activity. I do not think that we can possibly afford this kind of a strategy. Sir, one of the hon. Members was pleased to say that while planning our defence strategy, we have to take into account a wider perspective of the global phenomenon, the regional phenomenon and also the incidents which take place in the Indian Ocean. Sir, in spite of the limitation that I have, I can still say without any fear of contradiction that all the three aspects are taken into account while framing our policy so far as short-term and long term aspects of defence are concerned. We cannot possibly afford to ignore any of the factors. We have to take all the three factors into account and in our own way, we have to chalk out our own strategy of defence. We are not an aggressive country. We do not want to have any agression on anybody's territory. But, at the same time, we have to protect our own interests and that is why we have to frame our policy in such a manner that while we protect our borders, we do not create any problems for other countries as well.

Sir, a few of the hon. Members were pleased to ask: what is the policy that you have in view? So far as the short-term policy is concerned, the matter is made absolutely clear in the statement which I have made.

The first responsibility for protecting our long length of coastline, both on the east as well as on the west, is that of our Navy, and we will have to take whatever steps are necessary in order to allow the Navy to discharge its responsibility in a fitting manner and provide them with the necessary equipment, the necessary technical personnel, provide them with all the facilities that they require, and at the same time give them all support from the Airforce also where it is required. The first responsibility of the Navy will be to protect the coastline and the surrounding islands. One honourable Member was pleased to state that there are 318 islands on the west and almost 18 or 20 on the east. It is the responsibility of the Navy and also of our armed forces to see that all our islands are well-protected. I can assure him that even the farthest island which happens to be very near Indonesia, is well-looked after. In spite of the inclement weather and the unhygienic conditions prevailing there, still all the three forces are being stationed there; they have been stationed there. Then the question of coordination was also raised by some hon'ble Members. I can assure them that it is a Naval Officer of the rank of Rear-Admiral who is the coordinator of all the three forces and whenever any such eventuality arises, all the three forces are being coordinated by the Rear-Admiral and immediate coordinated action is being taken. So, there should be no room for any suspicion or doubt that any of the islands which are spread over at a long distance are being neglected or are not being cared for. That kind of a feeling should not be there in their minds.

Another point which, in fact, has also been made clear in the statement is that it is a very big route for import and export, and the actual turnover happens to be, especially from India, about 100 million tonnes. It is in our own interest to see that this route is kept safe, that none of the powers are able to interfere in the safe passage not only of the merchandise ships but also the other ships which we have. A very pertinent point can be raised—in fact, it has been raised, I think, by Mr. Gurupadaswamy: he is not here now—about the very presence of these warships. He asked: Have you taken it as an unkind and unfriendly act and registered a protest with the respective countries? In spite of the situation as it is prevailing in the Indian Ocean, a large number of warships are being stationed there, a large number of auxiliaries are

also there. They have the latest weaponry, they have the nuclear load. There is no doubt about it. I do not think the honourable Members expect that either the army or the naval officer should go to the ships and find out and inform the House as to what the details are of the different kinds of equipment that these particular warships have and the activities they are carrying out. I don't think we can possibly do it. Beyond a particular point, even according to the law of the seas, I don't think anybody can possibly object to the passage of the ships; even if they are warships, beyond a particular point we cannot possibly take any objection. Therefore, keeping all these things in view, I don't think that any overt or covert action has been taken by any of these powers so far, though everybody is apprehensive of the other. We are also equally concerned and even by mistake if there is a conflagration between the two, a very difficult situation can definitely arise. There is no doubt about it. That is why, keeping all these factors in view, we have to make the necessary preparations, equip the armed forces, especially the Navy, with the latest designs and see that they are able to discharge their responsibility properly and see that they are able to discharge their responsibility properly.

I think that previously also my esteemed colleague had taken the House into confidence and had given some figures and I do not think I can possibly add to what he has already stated. We have added about a few submarines of SSK type; acquisition of anti-submarine helicopters; construction of advanced Godavari class frigates; increased fleet strength by addition of missile boats, rocket launchers; increasing indigenisation of ship and consequent self-reliance, etc.

This was the information which my esteemed predecessor had shared with this House. Thereafter subsequent steps have been taken by the Government in order to see that we are able to meet the situation in an effective manner, particularly in the context of Pakistan having acquired some latest equipment from some countries in the world....

DR (SHRIMATI) NAJMA HEPTULLA: Will you name the country?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Of course everybody knows that Pakistan has received F-16 from America. There is no doubt about it. I do not think I should have to named it. But at the same time we cannot be oblivious to the fact that the latest equipment and even Harpoon missiles have been supplied by America to Pakistan. Their plea was that in the situation obtaining round about, Pakistan needs to be fully equipped in order to face the situation arising out of the Afghanistan incident. If I mistake not, I do not think that there is even one kilometer of coastal line so far as Afghanistan is concerned and the supply of Harpoon missiles to Pakistan is to enable Pakistan to combat the situation arising out of that is a very far-fetched interpretation. But at the same time we cannot possibly ignore this. The target can at any time be none other than ourselves and keeping that in view we have to equip ourselves properly and train our personnel in a proper manner.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I want to ask a clarification in the context of Harpoon missiles. Is it just on the shopping list? Or, has the Pakistan Navy already received it?

SHRI RAMANAND YADAV (Bihar): It is military secret.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: The nation has to know.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: I think whatever information I could possibly give to the House, I have given. This is a published thing. Everybody knows it and there is nothing new in it. I am not divulging anything. Everybody is aware of that.

A very effective point was made by Mrs. Najma Heptulla. She asked: You were in charge of Planning.

Are you satisfied that enough money has been provided for Navy in the Seventh Plan? I do not think that Honble Members are aware of the fact that

[Shri S. B. Chavan]

this was not a subject-matter of discussion in the Planning Commisison. Planning Commission never considered Defence budget. But ultimately when the Seventh Plan is being considered, this aspect of environment prevailing round about has to be taken into account and we have to consider what needs to be provided to the Army, Air Force and the Navy.

Sir, I think the honourable Member, Shri Jaswant Singh, said that some South Korean or Japanese trawlers seem to have encroached on our waters.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I did not say that.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: I am sorry then. I think some other honourable Member said it. If he is interested, I have the information with me which I can pass on to the honourable Member. I do not think that the other Members are interested in having this. Anyhow, for the information of the House, I think I should give that information. From the year 1981 onwards, Sir, I have the figures with regard to the number of vessels which were apprehended. In 1981, the number was 27; in 1982, it was 3; in 1983, it was 7; and, in 1984, it was 9. In all, the figure comes to 46. On the west coast, it was 22; on the east coast, it was 12; and, in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, it was 12. Nine were Taiwanese, 14 were of Thailand, 4 from Sri Lanka and three again from Thailand, 6 from Taiwan, one from Thailand.... I am sorry .. Taiwanese were 24, from Thailand it was 18 and from Sri Lanka the number was four. I have the details about what action was taken and how many were confiscated and what was done.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO): Mr. Kalyan Roy mentioned this point.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Yes, it was Mr. Kalyan Roy who had asked for this information. I had that information and I have given that information to the House.

Sir, the plan that we have for our long-term strategy is to see that we are able to plan for increase in our maritime reconnaisance and anti-submarine war capability especially through the induction of appropriate aircraft in this area, and also we are acquiring superior submarines. Generally, we modernise our fleet of service vessels by increasing the number of such vessels as well as their weapons and detection fitment. We are also endeavouring to upgrade our electronic warfare capabilities. So, this is the future plan of action that we have. I do not think that it would be possible for me to give all the details because of the factors or for obvious reasons which the honourable Members can definitely appreciate. I don't think that regarding the rest of the points I need to go into details because, in the Consultative Committee, though I am not supposed to say what transpired in the Consultative Committee, the honourable Members were taken into confidence and more details, more detailled information, were passed on to the honourable Members who happen to be the Members of the Consultative Committee.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED RAHMAT ALI): Now, we shall take up Special Mentions.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: You have not replied to any specific question at all. Sir, my specific question he has not answered. I asked whether our Navy has put up any projection for doubling its strength. That was not answered at all.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED RAHMAT ALI): We shall now take up Special Mentions.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: No, Sir, He has to answer the specific questions which were put to him. You have to answer the Members' specific questions and you cannot simply give a *bhashan* and get away with it. (*Interruptions*). Members have put specific questions and they have to be replied to specifically. Either he has toreply to them specifically or say

that he cannot reply. He cannot simply preach from there and go away. Or, the mode of the Calling-Attention Motion should be changed. Let the Minister reply after each Member speaks. Otherwise, there is no point in asking questions like this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED RAHMAT ALI): Yes, Special Mentions now. Mrs. Maimoona Sultan.

REFERENCE TO THE HIGH PRICES OF CERTAIN ANTI T.B. AND ANTI-LEPROSY DRUGS

SHRIMATI MAIMOONA SULTAN (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, with your permission, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that in the 20-Point Programme, which we are committed to implement both in letter and spirit, it has been stated clearly, categorically and emphatically that the anti-TB and anti-leprosy drugs are to be made available to the consumers at a cheaper price. The idea behind this has been that the poor could afford to buy this medicine and cure themselves of these dreaded diseases. But regret to say, Sir, that this has not been done at all. These medicines are not available at cheap prices, the anti-TB and the anti-leprosy medicines. At the moment, Sir, the prevailing price in the market of refampicin is very high. Refampicin is being sold and is available in the market at Rs. 8 per pack of four capsules. Is it a price at which the poor could afford to buy this medicine. I am within my right to ask the hon. Minister whether this is the way the directive of the Prime Minister given in the 20-Point Programme is being implemented. Sir, it is a highly intriguing situation. I cannot understand this. We have got a very competent Minister, a very able Minister. We also know that he is keenly aware of the hardships of the consumers and he is also trying that the consumer should get the benefits. But nothing happens. There has been no result. The results have been 'nil'. Then what is the bottleneck? What is the hurdle which is preventing the Hon'ble Minister from doing what he should do, what he wants to do. Sir, this is a big question mark which needs to be answered. I can only express my despair which I am doing. Sir, I state here categorically that during all these five years, since 1979 to 1984, no substantial relief has reached the poor T. B. patients and those suffering from leprosy.

Sir, in our country the incidence of T.B. is high. Every minute, every single minute in a day, one person loses his or her life: a precious life is lost. I do not think that the Ministry would be justified in taking full five years to decide the fate of the consumer.

Now, the point which I wanted to stress is that in sharp contrast to that, the manufacturers of this drug, Rimfampicin, which is anti-TB and anti-leprosy drug, have been allowed all the concessions, all the facilities, to take unintended profit which runs into crores of rupees.

I wish to cite an example. There are a number of major importers of this drug. There are so many instances. But I want to cite only one. M|s Lupin, to the best of my knowledge, have to pay Rs. 4 crores to the Government, but not a single penny has been paid till now and why should they pay anything when they are allowed to run away. They are let off so easily, without any punitive measures taken against them? Sir, this is a grave situation, and I hope you will agree with me, and I urge upon the Government, that strict action has to be taken against the defaulters. I know that the notices were given to the manufacturers of this drug to collect this unintended profit. But one full year has passed. The notice was given in 1983, and the last date was February 24th or something; that, too, has expired. I urge upon the Ministry to take immediate action against these people for defying the provisions of the law, for defying the interests of the consumers and the directive of the Prime Minister.

In the end, Sir. I want to address, through you, the hon. Minister and I am saying this with the best of intentions, and